

## **REMARKS**

Claims 62 and 64-69 were previously pending. Claims 62 and 64-69 are canceled herein. New claims 70-71 are added. Therefore, the applicant submits new claims 70-71 for consideration herein.

The Applicant wishes to express his appreciation to Examiner Leiva and his Supervisory Dmitry Suhol for their time and help during their meeting with the Applicant on January 27, 2009.

The Examiner noted that a Power of Attorney needs to be filed in this case. A combined Declaration/Power of Attorney was filed on 12/13/2007 appointing the undersigned's law firm, but this data was not entered into the USPTO database. Filed herewith is a request to enter the Power of Attorney along with another copy of the Declaration/Power of Attorney.

In view of the meeting, the Applicant has canceled all previously pending claims and has added new claims 70-71 in order to more simplify the examination of this application as well as to more clearly recite the invention as discussed during the meeting.

Claim 70 is intended to recite the species of the invention that is illustrated in at least Figure 10 of the application (although not limited to this exact configuration), while claim 71 is intended to recite the species of the invention that is illustrated in at least Figure 11 of the application (although not limited to this exact configuration).

The Applicant submits that the inventions recited in claims 70 and 71 are not obvious in view of the art discussed (including Moody and Carrico). While Moody shows a multiple line poker game, Moody shows that all final hands are derived from a single initial hand. Moody does not disclose or suggest derivative hand(s) based off derived hands, in the display arrangements as claimed. The combination of Moody and Carrico would not suggest the claimed invention either, as the combination of these references do not suggest (or lead one of ordinary skill in the art to create) forming derivative hand(s) based off derived hands as claimed, and doing so using the display arrangements as claimed.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 70-71 are patentable over the art cited in the file history in this application.

MPEP 2142 states, “The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious.” Thus, if an art rejection is to be maintained, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Office produce either: 1) a better reference which is closer to the claimed invention, or 2) clear rationale leading one to modify the cited references to create the invention in the manner claimed. This would be appreciated in order to clarify the record for appeal.

If there are any issues the Examiner wishes to discuss with the Applicant, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,  
Muskin & Cusick  
By/Jon H. Muskin #43,824/  
Jon. H. Muskin  
Reg. No. 43,824  
Customer # 43,536  
Tel (215) 853-8257